



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,559	01/25/2002	Abdul H. Al-Azzawe	SVL920010075US1/2306P	3805

7590 10/06/2004

SAWYER LAW GROUP  
P.O. Box 51418  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

MISTRY, O NEAL RAJAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/056,559

Applicant(s)

AL-AZZAWE ET AL.

Examiner

O'Neal R Mistry

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

1. This application has been examined.
2. Claims 1-47 are presented for examination.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

3. The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on January 25, 2002 are acceptable for the examination proceedings.

### ***Claim Objections***

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract cannot be more than two paragraph and more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-6, 9-22,25-38, 41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by “EAST Text Search Training”.

2. In regards to claim 1, The “EAST Text Search Training” states a method for tracking a plurality of actions against at least one object by a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) providing an output view, wherein the output view includes a first output area and a second output area(page 29). The examiner interprets that the Tree view, BRS

Art Unit: 2173

Form, and Details Grid are different windows that simultaneously display information about the action the user is performing with the interface;

(b) listing each of the plurality of actions in an action list in one of the first and second output area (page 47-49). The examiner interprets that the user has the ability to click on the List button to display further information about the action, which is being displayed in the Detail Grid;

(c) allowing a user to select one action from the action list (page 47-49). The examiner interprets that the user has the ability to click on the List button to display further information about the action, which is being displayed in the Detail Grid; and

(d) displaying information associated with the selected action in the other of the first and second output areas (page 47-49). The examiner notes that on page 49, East demonstrates how the information is being displayed in a Grid to the user, after the List button has been executed.

3. In regards to claim 2, The "EAST Text Search Training" states at least two of the plurality of actions are executed concurrently. (page 30) The examiner interprets that under the Pending Folder, that user is able to executed multiple queries, which the examiner interprets as actions, simultaneously with how much time has elapsed in the process.

4. In regards to claim 3, The "EAST Text Search Training" discloses the listing step (b) further includes the steps of:

(b1) displaying an action description for each action in the action list (page 40-44). The examiner interprets that after the enter button is pressed that the action

inserted into the pending folder, which displays the action and has a small description about the action;

(b2) displaying a running status of each action in the action list (Page 41). The prior art illustrates displaying the running status by display the time of the elapsed proces; and

(b3) displaying a name of an object against which each action in the action list is directed (page 44). The examiner interprets that a name is given to every action by addressing it will an "L" followed by an incremented numeric number.

In regards to claim 4, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the listing step (b) further includes the steps of:

(b4) displaying a start timestamp for each action in the action list (page 30). The prior art discloses how in the pending folder that a time is displayed describing the amount of elapsed time for the process; and

(b5) displaying an end timestamp for each action in the action list. (page 70). The examiner interprets that the end timestamp for each action is assigned a n L-number, meaning the length of time on how long the action had taken.

5. In regards to claim 5, The "EAST Text Search Training" discloses the step of displaying the naming status (b) further includes the steps of:

(b2i) presenting a textual description of the naming status (page 49). The examiner interprets that the actions are described using the L-number set; and

(b2ii) provide a visual description of the naming status (page 49) The examiner interprets that right next to the numeric number is description of the action in the Active

folder to the user to refer to quickly, if the user decides to elaborate in the detail the user by user a pointing device and highlight the action.

6. In regards to claim 6, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the listing step (b) further includes the step of:

(b4) entering a new action to the action list when the user has submitted the new action against an object (page 42). The examiner interprets that the user has the ability to insert multiple actions as an action is going on.

7. In regards to claim 9, The "EAST Text Search Training" states (e) allowing the user to remove at least one of the actions from the action list (page 85-87). The prior art illustrates steps in emptying the Trash folder, after the user has temporarily deleted actions for the Active folder.

8. In regards to claim 10, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the step of removing the at least one action (e) further includes:

(e1) setting a maximum number of actions in the action list( page 44); and

(e2) replacing a least recent action in the action list with a new action when the maximum number of actions has been reached (page 71). The examiner interprets that if the user has the ability to re-use L-numbers in the Active folder, that is a form removing an old action, and replacing it with a new one.

9. In regards to claim 11, The "EAST Text Search Training" discloses the step of removing the at least one action (e) further includes:

(e1) selecting an action for removal (page 85-86); and

(e2) providing a popup menu to the user, wherein the popup menu allows the user to remove the selected action (page 86).

10. In regards to claim 12, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the step of removing the at least one action (e) further includes:

(e1) selecting an action for removal(page 85-86); and

(e2) pressing a predefined key on a keyboard to delete the selected action (page 86).

11. In regards to claim 13, The "EAST Text Search Training" discloses the information associated with the selected action includes a message, an associated result, and at least one parameter (page 50).

12. In regards to claim 14, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the step of displaying (d) further includes the steps of:

(d1) allowing the user to select one of the message, the associated result, and the at least one parameter for the selected action (page 50); and

(d2) repeating step (d1) with the user is satisfied (page 53). The examiner interprets in the prior art that the user has the ability to Re-execute the searched that have archived.

13. In regards to claim 15, The "EAST Text Search Training" discloses the step of (e) repeating steps (c) and (d) until the user is satisfied (page 50-53). The examiner can re-execute archived search over and over again, or even modify each action slightly to get the exact result.

14. In regards to claim 16, The "EAST Text Search Training" states the step of (f) allowing the user to print, save, copy, and append to a file the information associated with the selected action (page 51 & 117). In the prior art the user on page 51 illustrates the step in saving actions the user prefers, and page 117 illustrates the step in printing information of the actions.

15. Claims 17, 33 are substantially equivalent to claim 1, therefore claims 17, 33 are rejected because of similar rationale.

16. Claims 18, 34 are substantially equivalent to claim 2, therefore claims 18, 34 are rejected because of similar rationale.

17. Claims 19, 35 are substantially equivalent to claim 3, therefore claims 19, 35 are rejected because of similar rationale.

18. Claims 20, 36 are substantially equivalent to claim 4, therefore claims 20, 33 are rejected because of similar rationale.

19. Claims 21, 37 are substantially equivalent to claim 5, therefore claims 21, 37 are rejected because of similar rationale.

20. Claims 22, 38 are substantially equivalent to claim 6, therefore claims 22, 38 are rejected because of similar rationale.

21. Claims 25, 41 are substantially equivalent to claim 9, therefore claims 25, 41 are rejected because of similar rationale.

22. Claims 26, 42 are substantially equivalent to claim 10, therefore claims 26, 42 are rejected because of similar rationale.



23. Claims 27, 43 are substantially equivalent to claim 11, therefore claims 27, 43 are rejected because of similar rationale.

24. Claims 28, 44 are substantially equivalent to claim 12, therefore claims 28, 44 are rejected because of similar rationale.

25. Claims 29, 45 are substantially equivalent to claim 13, therefore claims 29, 45 are rejected because of similar rationale.

26. Claims 30, 46 are substantially equivalent to claim 14, therefore claims 30, 46 are rejected because of similar rationale.

27. Claims 31 is substantially equivalent to claim 15, therefore claims 31 is rejected because of similar rationale.

28. Claims 32, 47 are substantially equivalent to claim 16, therefore claims 32, 47 are rejected because of similar rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7,8,23,24,39, & 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "EAST Text Search Training" in view of Netter (U.S. Application Number 2002/0038388).

"EAST Text Search Training" shows an action list that has a name and a timestamp of the action, which is being performed but does not show a method of sorting the actions that are located in the Action folder.

Netter shows an apparatus that allows the user to query the database via using a web browser, tacking information that is being distributed, and also discloses a method of sorting the action information by name, time, or date.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Netter, method of sorting by name, time, or data with "EAST Text Search Training", which allows multiple actions to be executed currently and that display all the actions' results.

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because it would all for a user to separately control the information or actions, including selected portions thereof, as desired by the user.

29. In regards to claim 7, The "EAST Text Search Training" states sorting the action list according to one of the start timestamp and the end timestamp of each action on the action list (page 41). The examiner infers that after an action is complete the action is give a L-number, which an end timestamp, and is sorted in numeric order.

30. In regards to claim 8, The "EAST Text Search Training" states (e) sorting the action list by one of the action description, the running status and the object name (Netter, paragraph 160) [The date engine 82 allows searching of a session by date, either individually or by date groupings. The user engine 84 allows searching by conference participant. Searching may be achieved by entering a user's conference identification number, or other types of identifiers, as desired. Similarly, the event type engine 86 facilitates searching of the sales interaction data by applet type employed in the sales interaction. Any custom applet, which was captured during a session, may be listed in an event type drop down menu. Also, the sort engine 88 allows for searching of the data by any classification such as by user name, session number, time interval, event description, and/or session date.]. The examiner interprets that user has the ability to sort all actions by name or date. The date of the action could also be the timestamp of the actions.

31. Claims 23, 39 are substantially equivalent to claim 7, therefore claims 23, 39 are rejected because of similar rationale.

32. Claims 24, 40 are substantially equivalent to claim 8, therefore claims 24, 40 are rejected because of similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***


Art Unit: 2173

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O'Neal R Mistry whose telephone number is (703) 305-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W Cabeca can be reached on (703)308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O'Neal Mistry  
Assistant Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2173  
[o'neal.mistry@uspto.gov](mailto:o'neal.mistry@uspto.gov)

  
RAYMOND J. BAYERL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2173